

REMARKS

In the outstanding official action, claim 3 was objected to because the claim, as presented, depends from itself. Accordingly, claim 3 is herewith amended to correct this typographical error, so that claim 3 now properly depends from claim 1, thereby overcoming the claim objection.

On the merits, claims 1-4, 7-8 and 10-12 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Yokogawa, for the reasons of record, with the remaining claims being rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the cited and applied art and for the reasons of record. In response, independent claims 1 and 4 are herewith amended in order to more particularly and precisely recite the novel and unobvious features of the instant invention, and it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 4, and the remaining claims depending therefrom, are now clearly patentably distinguishable over the cited and applied references for the reasons detailed below.

In the anticipation rejection of independent claims 1 and 4, it is suggested in the Action that Yokogawa discloses an optical disk drive apparatus and a laser driver circuit meeting all of the limitations of the claims as previously presented. However, as presently amended, independent claims 1 and 4 now additionally recite that a parasitic capacitance of the laser resonates with an inductor to form a resonant LC circuit of an LC oscillator circuit.

It is respectfully submitted that this additional limitation is neither shown nor suggested by Yokogawa.

On the contrary, the cited and applied portions of the reference clearly show a substantially different circuit, having a high-frequency oscillator (1) and a separate, external laser diode (4) which does not form any portion of the resonant circuit of the oscillator. The cited Elements 3 (C and L) also do not form a resonant circuit, but rather are clearly described as a filter circuit which permits the application of the higher frequency signal to the semiconductor laser 4 while preventing the application of the high frequency signal to the automatic power control unit 2. Thus, none of these cited components comprise a resonant LC circuit employing the parasitic capacitance of the laser as presently claimed.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 4, and the remaining claims depending therefrom, are clearly patentably distinguishable over the cited and applied references. Accordingly, allowance of the instant application is respectfully

submitted to be justified at the present time, and favorable consideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Steven R. Biren, Reg. 26,531
Attorney
(914) 333-96430